

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,341		09/11/2003	Hiroki Ogata	YAMA-65283	5146	
24201	7590	06/05/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	ER PATT		SAGER, MA	SAGER, MARK ALAN		
6060 CENTER DRIVE 10TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045				3712	-	
				DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/660,341	OGATA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		M. A. Sager	3712				
Period for I	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	-	į l				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
2a)∏ TI 3)∏ Si	desponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>8/1</u> his action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ The ince this application is in condition for allow losed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matters, pr					
Disposition	n of Claims						
4a 5)	ne specification is objected to by the Examine drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and applicant may not request that any objection to the	rawn from consideration. d/or election requirement. iner. ccepted or b) □ objected to by the he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)	,						
2) 🔲 Notice o 3) 🔯 Informat	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 lo(s)/Mail Date <u>11/20/03, 1/12/04</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail C 5) Notice of Informal C 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/660,341 Page 2

Art Unit: 3712

Preliminary Amendment

1. Preliminary amendment received Aug. 12, 2004, cancels original claim 1 and adds claims 2-27. It is noted that amended claims appear to broaden original invention at least due to elimination of vibration motor, means of supplying electric current and pair of diverging grips while maintaining the plurality of finger-manipulatable controllers on the housing, as contained in new claims for first and second controllers.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 2-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6171191. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the vibration motor, means of supplying electric current and pair of diverging grips limited the invention where patentability was not contained therein, thus by eliminating vibration motor,

Application/Control Number: 10/660,341

Art Unit: 3712

means of supplying electric current and pair of diverging grips from the claims, a broader invention is secured where patentability lies within

- 3. Claims 2-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double

 patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 66641479 Although the

 conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because at

 least the structure for the circuit board, supportive member, vibration motor and pair of diverging

 grips limited the invention where patentability was not contained therein, thus by eliminating the

 circuit board, supportive member, vibration motor, means of supplying electric current and pair

 of diverging grips from the claims, a broader invention is secured where patentability lies within.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. A. Sager whose telephone number is 571-272-4454. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F, 0700-1730 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, John Hotaling can be reached on 571-272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Sager Primary Examiner Page 3

Art Unit 3712

Mas

mas